UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,174	03/26/2004	Suchit Kaura	ORCL-2003-139-01	7993

7590 03/12/2007	EXAMINER
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP Third Floor Two North Market Street San Jose, CA 95113	AHLUWALIA, NAVNEET K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/810,174	KAURA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Navneet K. Ahluwalia	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:

　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is in response to the Amendment filed December 26, 2006.

Response to Arguments

2.   Claims 1 – 22 are pending in this Office Action. After a further consideration and a thorough examination of the present application, claims 1 – 22 remain rejected.

3.   Applicant's arguments filed with respect to claims 1 – 22 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that there is no teaching in Lord of shared objects and node specific objects.

In response to Applicant's argument, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Lord teaches shared objects and node specific objects in paragraphs 0093 and 0072. Paragraph 0093 discloses the node being enabled in the cluster to share all of the files on the disk. Furthermore, Lord discloses in paragraph 0072 the specific node data structure for the file systems.

Claims 2 – 22 recite the same subject matter and for the same reasons as cited above the rejection is maintained.

Hence, Applicant's arguments do not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art of record. In light of the foregoing arguments, the 102 rejections are sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims 1 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lord

et al. ('Lord' herein after) (US 20030028514 A1).

With respect to claim 1,

        Lord discloses a method of providing shared objects and node-specific objects in

a cluster file system (Figure 3, Lord), said method comprising:

-        providing to a particular shared object an attribute that indicates any

        object created in said particular shared object from this point in time will be

        designated as node-specific (page 6 paragraph 0096, Lord); and

-        when a node causes a file system operation that is node-specific to be

        performed by accessing said particular shared object, performing said file

        system operation in an alternate directory corresponding to said node,

        wherein said alternate directory supports a node-specific object (page 6

        paragraph 0100, Lord).

With respect to claim 2,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 1 wherein said particular shared object is a container-type shared object (paragraphs 0035 and 0070, Lord).

With respect to claim 3,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 1 wherein said particular shared object is a directory (Figure 7, paragraphs 0070 and 0084, Lord).

With respect to claim 4,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 1 wherein said performing said file system operation in said alternate directory includes:

- associating a pointer with said particular shared object (paragraphs 0038, 0135, Lord);

- using said pointer to point to a table having alternate directory information for each node (paragraph 0135, Lord);

- if said alternate directory information for said node indicates that said alternate directory has not been created, creating said alternate directory for said node and updating said table with a location of said alternate directory (paragraphs 103, 123, Lord).

With respect to claim 5,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 1 wherein said file system operation that is node-specific includes creating one of a node-specific file and a node-

specific directory (paragraphs 0096 – 0097, Lord).

With respect to claim 6,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 5 wherein said file system

operation that is node-specific includes modifying one of said node-specific file and said

node-specific directory (paragraph 0101, Lord).

With respect to claim 7,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 5 wherein said file system

operation that is node-specific includes deleting one of said node-specific file and said

node-specific directory (paragraphs 0079, 0143, Lord).

With respect to claim 8,

Lord discloses a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable

instructions stored therein for performing a method of providing shared objects and

node-specific objects in a cluster file system (Figure 3, Lord), said method comprising:

- providing to a particular shared object an attribute that indicates any

    object created in said particular shared object from this point in time will be

    designated as node-specific (page 6 paragraph 0096, Lord); and

- when a node causes a file system operation that is node-specific to be

    performed by accessing said particular shared object, performing said file

    system operation in an alternate directory corresponding to said node,

wherein said alternate directory supports a node-specific object (page 6

paragraph 0100, Lord).

With respect to claim 9,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 8 wherein said

particular shared object is a container-type shared object (paragraphs 0035 and 0070,

Lord).

With respect to claim 10,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 8 wherein said

particular shared object is a directory (Figure 7, paragraphs 0070 and 0084, Lord).

With respect to claim 11,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 8 wherein said

performing said file system operation in said alternate directory includes:

-        associating a pointer with said particular shared object (paragraphs

         0038, 0135, Lord);

-        using said pointer to point to a table having alternate directory

         information for each node (paragraph 0135, Lord);

-        if said alternate directory information for said node indicates that said

         alternate directory has not been created, creating said alternate directory for

said node and updating said table with a location of said alternate directory

(paragraphs 103, 123, Lord).

With respect to claim 12,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 8 wherein said

file system operation that is node-specific includes creating one of a node-specific file

and a node-specific directory (paragraphs 0096 – 0097, Lord).

With respect to claim 13,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 12 wherein

said file system operation that is node-specific includes modifying one of said node-

specific file and said node-specific directory (paragraph 0101, Lord).

With respect to claim 14,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 12 wherein

said file system operation that is node-specific includes deleting one of said node-

specific file and said node-specific directory (paragraphs 0079, 0143, Lord).

With respect to claim 15,

Lord discloses a system comprising:

-        a cluster having a plurality of nodes, a mass storage device coupled to

said cluster (Figure 3, Lord); and

-       a cluster file system configured to automatically provide shared objects

and node-specific objects to each node without duplicating shared objects

when providing node-specific objects (page 6 paragraph 0096, Lord).

With respect to claim 16,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 15 wherein said cluster file system

enables providing to a particular shared object an attribute that indicates any object

created in said particular shared object from this point in time will be designated as

node-specific (page 6 paragraph 0096, Lord), and wherein when one of said nodes

causes a file system operation that is node-specific to be performed by accessing said

particular shared object, said cluster file system performs said file system operation in

an alternate directory corresponding to said node, wherein said alternate directory

supports a node-specific object (page 6 paragraph 0100, Lord).

With respect to claim 17,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 16 wherein said cluster file system

associates a pointer with said particular shared object (paragraphs 0038, 0135, Lord),

wherein said cluster file system uses said pointer to point to a table having alternate

directory information for each node (paragraph 0135, Lord), and wherein if said

alternate directory information for said node indicates that said alternate directory has

not been created, said cluster file system creates said alternate directory for said node

and updates said table with a location of said alternate directory (paragraphs 103, 123,

Lord).

With respect to claim 18,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 16 wherein said file system

operation that is node-specific includes creating one of a node-specific file and a node-

specific directory (paragraphs 0096 – 0097, Lord).

With respect to claim 19,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 18 wherein said file system

operation that is node-specific includes modifying one of said node-specific file and said

node-specific directory (paragraph 0101, Lord).

With respect to claim 20,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 18 wherein said file system

operation that is node-specific includes deleting one of said node-specific file and said

node-specific directory (paragraphs 0079, 0143, Lord).

With respect to claim 21,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 15 wherein said particular shared

object is a container-type shared object (paragraphs 0035 and 0070, Lord).

With respect to claim 22,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 15 wherein said particular shared

object is a directory (Figure 7, paragraphs 0070 and 0084, Lord).

Conclusion

6.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded

of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Navneet K. Ahluwalia whose telephone number is 571-

272-5636.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Alam T. Hosain can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Navneet K. Ahluwalia
Examiner
Art Unit 2166

TM 3/8/07

Dated: 03/07/2007

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER